APR 2 7 2006

Typed or printed name

MW AT

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Date

are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/784.211 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL 02-24-2004 First Named Inventor **FORM** Takashi FUJII Art Unit 1734 **Examiner Name** J. Sells (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 46379 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC $\overline{}$ Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with Reply to Missing Parts/ this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 18-2220. A duplicate copy of this sheet is attached. Incomplete Application [X] Any additional excess claim fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16. Reply to Missing Parts [X] Any additional patent application processing fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17. under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. (Customer No. 001609) Signature and Wa Printed name Garrett V. Davis Date Reg. No. 04-27-2006 32,023 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



46379

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Takashi FUJII et al. : Group Art Unit: 1734

Serial No.: 10/784,211 : Examiner: J. Sells

Filed: February 24, 2004

For: PROCESS FOR PRODUCING COLD

FIELD EMISSION CATHODES

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the January 27, 2006 Office Action.

In the Action, claims 1-34 are rejected. In view of the following comments, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-34

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,138 to Nakamoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,436,221 to Chang et al. Nakamoto is cited for disclosing a field emission cold cathode device by forming nanotubes on a substrate and then applying a conductive material over the nanotubes and the substrate. Chang et al. is cited as allegedly disclosing a taping method to remove a portion of the carbon nanotubes from a substrate. The rejection is based on the position that it would have been obvious to modify the process of Nakamoto according to Chang et al. to include a taping